1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 9 ALFRED LO, 10 Case No. 2:13-cv-02329-JCM-NJK Plaintiff(s), 11 ORDER DENYING WITHOUT PREJUDICE MOTION TO COMPEL VS. 12 VERIZON WIRELESS LLC, et al., (Docket No. 54) 13 Defendant(s). 14 15 Pending before the Court is Defendant's motion to compel. Docket No. 54. It appears that Plaintiff, who is proceeding *pro se*, attempted to respond to that motion by filing discovery responses 16 17 with the Court. See Docket No. 55. In light of the discovery responses, it may be that the discovery dispute has been mooted or has otherwise changed since the time Defendant filed its motion to 18 19 compel. Accordingly, the motion to compel is hereby DENIED without prejudice. 20 Lastly, the Court reiterates that a party seeking to propound discovery or respond to discovery 21 must serve those papers on opposing counsel, rather than file them with the Court. See Local Rule 22 26-8. 23 IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: February 2, 2015 24 25 26 NANCY J. KOPPL United States Magistrate Judge 27 28